

|   |                        |                                |  |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>            |  |
|   | 10/517,991             | LEVAVASSEUR, JEAN-LUC<br>J L L |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>                |  |
|   | BARBARA J. MUSSER      | 1791                           |  |

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Rejected

(1) BARBARA J. MUSSER.

(3) Michael Stegger.

(2) Jason Chung.

(4) Richard Crispino.

**Date of Interview:** 20 August 2009

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 1st

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

none

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner asked for an explanation of what E was. Applicant indicated that Emax in the claim was the maximum error and it was plus or minus the numbers given. Examiner indicated the claim did not state that and suggested that it meant that the error could only be between 2 and 2.5, not less or more. Examiner was unclear how E was calculated as the developable surface was the shape of the septum and thus the error would be zero as a developable surface is one that a flat sheet can contact all of without creasing or tearing and thus the flat pieces of the septum would be in contact with the entire developable surface. Applicant needed to further review the case before making more comments.